

REMARKS

The Examiner's comments from the non-final Office Action mailed July 30, 2007 have been carefully considered. Claims 1-13 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims 1-13 in a later-filed continuing application. Claims 28-40 are newly added. Accordingly, claims 14-40 are pending in the application. Claims 14, 15, 17-22, and 27 are amended. Support for these changes is found throughout the specification and figures, e.g., on page 13, line 15 through page 15, line 14. No new matter has been added.

Reexamination and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections

Claim 1-5, 14-18 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,171,443 B2), and in view of Tso et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,892,226 B1). Claims 1-5 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection with respect to these claims moot. With respect to claims 14-18 and 27, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 14 recites, in part, creating a page object based on a page file. Each component object of the page object represents a user control of the page file. Claim 14 also recites inserting retrieved component objects that represent user controls within the page file and created component objects that represent user controls of the page file into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system.

Tiemann does not disclose or suggest inserting retrieved component objects that represent user controls of the page file and created component objects that represent user controls of the page file into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system. Rather, Tiemann discloses sending dynamic HTML to a client and separately sending static HTML if the static HTML is subsequently requested. See *Tiemann*, col. 2, lines 33-41, and FIG. 2. The page is assembled at the client.

Tso does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann. Tso also does not disclose or suggest inserting retrieved component objects that represent user controls of the page file and created component objects that represent user controls of the page file into a hierarchical tree

data model at the first computing system. The advertising code in Tso is not a retrieved component object or a created component object as recited in claim 14. Component objects in claim 14 represent user controls within a page file. The advertising code in Tso does not represent user controls within a page file. Rather, the advertising code in Tso inserts additional content into a requested web page.

Furthermore, no motivation is provided in Tso, Tiemann, or elsewhere to insert retrieved component objects and created component objects that represent user controls of a page file into a hierarchical tree data model.

For at least these reasons, Tiemann would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 14, even in view of Tso. Claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 14-18 are respectfully requested.

Claim 27 recites, in part, receiving a request from a client computing system for a web page having a plurality of components, each of the components being either a static component or a dynamic component. Claim 27 also recites assembling the static components and the dynamic components into a hierachal data model.

Tiemann does not disclose or suggest assembling static components and dynamic components of a web page into a hierachal data model at a server computing system. Rather, Tiemann discloses sending dynamic HTML to a client and separately sending static HTML if the static HTML is subsequently requested. See *Tiemann*, col. 2, lines 33-41, and FIG. 2. The page is assembled at the client.

Tso does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann. Tso also does not disclose or suggest assembling static components and dynamic components of a web page into a hierachal data model at a server computing system. The advertising code in Tso is not a dynamic component of a web page as recited in claim 14. The dynamic components recited in claim 14 are components of a requested web page. The advertising code in Tso does not represent content of a requested web page. Rather, the advertising code in Tso inserts additional content (e.g., a module for displaying different banner advertisements) into the requested web page. No motivation is provided in Tso, Tiemann, or elsewhere to insert retrieved component objects and

created component objects that represent content of the requested web page into a hierarchical tree data model at a first computing system.

Claims 6-9 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann and Tso in view of Schloss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,844 B1). Claims 6-9 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection with respect to these claims moot. With respect to claims 19-22, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 19-22 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 14. Accordingly, claims 19-22 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Schloss does not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso.

Schloss also fails to disclose or suggest inserting retrieved component objects that represent user controls of the page file and created component objects that represent user controls of the page file into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system. Rather, Schloss discloses sending a page object to a client computing system after extracting uncachable fragments from the page object at a server computing system. *See, e.g., Schloss, column 2, lines 43-48; column 4, lines 50-55; and column 5, lines 7-9.*

For at least these reasons, Tiemann would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 19-22, even in view of Tso and Schloss. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 19-22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann, Tso and Schloss in view of Mattson (U.S. Patent No. 5,434,992). Claims 10, 11, and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection with respect to these claims moot. With respect to claims 23, 24, and 26, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 23, 24, and 26 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 14. Accordingly, claims 23, 24, and 26 are allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Schloss and Mattson do not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso. Both Schloss and Mattson also fail to disclose or suggest

inserting retrieved component objects that represent user controls of the page file and created component objects that represent user controls of the page file into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system.

For at least these reasons, Tiemann would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claims 23, 24, and 26, even in view of Tso, Schloss, and Mattson. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 23, 24, and 26 is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tiemann, Tso and Schloss in view of Smith et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,802,600). Claim 12 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby rendering the rejection with respect to this claim moot. With respect to claim 25, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 25 depends, directly or indirectly, from claim 14. Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable over the combination of Tiemann and Tso for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claim 14. Schloss and Smith do not overcome the shortcomings of Tiemann and Tso. Both Schloss and Smith also fail to disclose or suggest inserting retrieved component objects that represent user controls of the page file and created component objects that represent user controls of the page file into a hierarchical tree data model at the first computing system.

For at least these reasons, Tiemann would not lead a person skilled in the art to the invention of claim 25, even in view of Tso, Schloss, and Smith. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 25 is respectfully requested.

New Claims

Claims 28-40 are newly added. Support for these claims is found throughout the specification and figures, e.g., on page 13, line 15 through page 15, line 14, and in FIGS. 3-5. No new matter has been added.

To the extent the above rejections apply to new claims 28-40, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 28 recites, in part, retrieving at a server computing device a page file associated with the requested web page. The page file includes control references, which include

instructions for obtaining associated page components of the requested web page. Instructions of server controls are stored within the page file. Instructions of user controls are stored in a separate file. Claim 28 also recites obtaining from a cache the page component associated with each user control that supports output caching and that is available at the cache of the server computing device and generating the page component associated with each user control that supports output caching and is not available at the cache of the server computing device.

None of the cited references discloses or suggests retrieving at a server computing device a page file including control references including instructions of server controls that are stored within the page file and instructions of user controls that are stored in a separate file. Furthermore, none of the cited references disclose or suggest obtaining from a cache the page component associated with each user control that supports output caching and that is available at the cache and generating the page component associated with each user control that supports output caching and is not available at the cache.

For at least these reasons, claim 28 is allowable over the cited references. Claims 29-40 depend from claim 28 and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Examination and allowance of claims 28-40 is respectfully requested.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 09/899,539
Reply to Office Action mailed on July 30, 2007

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(612) 332-5300

Date: December 31, 2007

/Robert A. Kalinsky/
Name: Robert A. Kalinsky
Reg. No.: 50,471

RAK/JKS:rlk/pll